

would eliminate the invitation that both the chairman and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) have for a supplemental, but it would not prohibit the President from coming with the supplemental. It prohibits any funds that we currently have for fiscal year 2000.

Mr. ANDREWS. Reclaiming my time, it would though, if I am correct, prohibit the transfer of any funds from one account to another for this purpose; is that correct?

Mr. SOUDER. Absolutely.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

(Mr. SHADEGG asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER), and I want to compliment him for bringing it forward. But I also want to clarify the discussion which just occurred because I think it may have left some ambiguity in the minds of Members.

Let me make it very, very clear. This amendment does not in any way prevent the President from coming forward in a straightforward fashion and saying to the Congress, "I want and I request and I ask you to appropriate additional funds for the conduct of this war or for the conduct of peacekeeping."

What this amendment does is say, "Mr. President, the power we have in the Congress is the power of the purse. You have clearly indicated that you are going to proceed on your own without your authority." So be it.

But we do have the power of the purse, and this amendment would say, "Mr. President, you have 4 months to conclude the action, and then if in that 4 months you want more money, come back to the Congress and ask for it," and I think that is a perfectly legitimate role for the Congress to play; indeed, it is the role that the Constitution contemplates that we should play, and I urge my colleagues to support the amendment for that reason.

But I want to move on to another topic because I think there is going to be some additional confusion later in the discussion. Later today, on this bill, my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), I believe is going to offer an amendment to strike the language in the base bill which prohibits funds in fiscal year 2000 from being used for the war.

Specifically, on page 270 in section 1006 he is going to move to strike lines 21 through 24. That is the language that specifically prohibits the President from using fiscal year 2000 moneys for the conduct of this war or peacekeeping without coming back to the Congress for permission.

But in a move which will confuse Members he is going to leave in place

the following language in subsection B of that section on page 271 which creates the impression that the President will have to come to Congress and ask permission, but not the reality.

I urge my colleagues to support the Souder amendment and to oppose the Skelton amendment, Mr. Chairman. The Skelton amendment appears to force the President to come to the Congress for proper budget authority for the conduct of this war, but it will not do that.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I have always found it important to read what the amendments say, and this particular amendment strikes that provision which requires the President to come forth with a supplemental. Further, it prohibits, it prohibits other appropriated or supplemental appropriations by these words:

None of the funds appropriated or otherwise available to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2000 may be used for military operations in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

I mean, how much clearer can we get? That cuts it off.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SKELTON. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, let me precisely explain. The gentleman is right. This language says that this piece of legislation would not authorize the President to continue the conduct of the war or the peacekeeping mission. That would leave the President with the option, which he has at any time, to bring forward a request for a supplemental appropriation specifically for the operation of the war. Then we could debate that issue, should we fund the war and at what level, or should we fund the peacekeeping effort and at what level?

Nothing in this language says the President is precluded from bringing forward such a proposal, and I give the gentleman back his time.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who offered the amendment asked, "Duke, would you like to speak in favor of the amendment?" Not only a good guy, he has got a good heart, and I would like to talk to the gentleman on why I oppose this particular amendment.

First of all, I have already spoken to why I did not believe that we should be in Kosovo in the first place. I have also spoken to why I thought that Rambouillet actually caused the war, that there was a no-win from the start, that the President did not understand that we could not have an independent Kosovo, that they would never give that up, and that they had fears that the KLA would reprise, and we could

not take out other military and police, and that there had to be something in between.

Well, now the new agreement said that we will have Russian and Greek troops, which I wanted in there, to separate the two sides, and there is a difference between war and potential peace and what we do support.

George Bush in Desert Storm had our allies pay for Desert Storm, and I think that NATO ought to pay for this, at least 99 percent of this, and let the United States back out of it because we have been into all of the other things that we have talked about, from Iraq to other areas, as well as in the Sudan.

I disagreed with my colleague on his amendment because I felt that it took money out of the military requirements when our Joint Chiefs said we need 148 billion just to come up to a low-ball figure, the President, under the Bottom Up Review and the QDR; and I understand now that the supplemental will come in and not do that. But I would still oppose the gentleman's amendment if it takes the money out, because there is never a payback in this business.

And I would say that under this amendment it totally ties the hands of the President as far as our troops, and I do not want to do that. I am trying to get us out of Kosovo. I am trying to do it because I do not think that we should demonize one side or another on this because both sides have been, but at the same time I do not want to totally tie the hands of the President if there is hope for peace and we can separate those forces.

And with winter coming on, there is no electricity, no food, no heat, and there are innocent Yugoslavians and innocent Albanians at the same time. How are we going to handle that? I would like NATO to pay for it all. I am not naive enough to think they are going to do that.

I thank the gentleman from my heart for having given me the time, and part of me supports what the gentleman is trying to do, but overall I would have to vote against the gentleman's amendment and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my friend from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) stating this. Obviously he did read the amendment, as I did, and the language is pretty clear.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SKELTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Actually, I had not, but I listened to what the gentleman said.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for having yielded this time to me.

And he has pointed out, pointed to the language in his bill that the bill refers to 2000 money, and that would not